

Task Force on Post-Tenure Review Cycle  
Frequently Asked Questions  
Updated 2/25/11

On November 4, 2010, the Task Force on the Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Cycle recommended to the Provost an alternative review cycle for tenured faculty members and academic professionals on continuing status. The recommendation allowed for units to adopt a cycle of review involving comprehensive reviews at least every five years, with expedited reviews conducted annually by the Annual Review Committee (ARC, or comparable committee) and the Department Chair (or comparable individual). Expedited reviews (ER) would affirm the rating established at the comprehensive review (CR), or call for a full comprehensive review.

In response to the recommendation, a number of questions have been raised. This document, approved by members of the Task Force, addresses these questions.

**Question:** What rating is affirmed in the expedited review? Is it each category (teaching, research and service) or the overall rating?

**Answer:** The expedited review affirms the overall rating.

**Question:** How does the system affect the opportunity for merit pay increases?

**Answer:** The system still provides ratings, which are computed for merit increases. Merit raises generally require the average of three years' ratings, which this system allows. The "affirmed" ratings of expedited reviews and/or alternative ratings from comprehensive reviews will be used. Examples (using 4 pt scale for our ratings):

Prof ratings: CR 3, ER 3, ER 3; average is 3

Prof ratings: ER 3, CR 4, ER 4, average is 3.7

Prof ratings: ER 3, ER 3, CR 4; average is 3.3

**Question:** Since the expedited review affirms a rating, do faculty members have to submit the same evidence as they would for a comprehensive review?

**Answer:** The units can decide the nature of the evidence submitted. Minimally, a faculty member must submit course evaluations and a vita (which has evidence of research/creative activity and service).

**Question:** You speak of "units." Is that the department? The college?

**Answer:** The unit is defined locally, and this proposal does not alter that. If a college has uniform practices in annual review processes, the college would be the deciding unit level. If there is variation by department, school, or area currently, that would continue.

**Question:** What was the motivation for this proposal?

**Answer:** A number of department chairs asked the Provost to consider options that might save chairs and faculty time, while maintaining a positive and supportive evaluation system.

**Question:** Will this really save anyone any time?

**Answer:** Yes. These procedures will make most submissions for tenured faculty less work intensive, since expedited reviews only involve submitting an updated vita and course evaluations. In addition, review committees will be required to conduct comprehensive reviews of far fewer files each year. Expedited reviews will most often result in a brief affirmation of ratings given at the last comprehensive review.

**Question:** What if someone wants to put up his or her materials for comprehensive review every year?

**Answer:** Nothing in the proposal would prohibit this.

**Question:** Why doesn't the proposal address non-tenure track faculty members on multiple-year contracts?

**Answer:** The Task Force agrees they should be given a similar review process, but felt that COFS did not allow for such a review at this time. The Task Force is recommending a revision of COFS to allow this.

**Question:** Is this consistent with ABOR and COFS policies?

**Answer:** Yes. The proposed system maintains an annual review, conforming to both documents. ABOR policy states, "Annual performance evaluations for all tenured faculty members shall be conducted by unit heads and/or peer committees..." (ABOR Policy 6-201 H. 1. Post-Tenure Review; Elements of Post-Tenure Review Process). COFS states that the post-tenure review process begins with and is linked to the Annual Review for each tenured faculty member (COFS 1.4.7 and 1.4.7.1 b.). "The Annual Review will be conducted by the Chair and either an Annual Review Committee or a Faculty Status Committee as determined by the academic unit structure" (COFS 1.4. 6.1.1).

**Question:** What happens if a faculty member's workload shifts dramatically? For example, if someone has been on a load of 80% teaching, 10% research and 10% service, and they shift to a 40-40-20, does this require a comprehensive review?

**Answer:** The proposed cycle was built on the premise of continuing in a relatively stable pattern of workload allocation. Whenever there is a substantial change in load allocation (a change of 30% or more in any one category) it may be appropriate for the unit to require a comprehensive review. Some examples illustrate this:

Load previous 3 years:	Altered load:	CR required?
40%T, 40%R, 20%S	50%T, 40%R, 10%S	No
60%T, 20%R, 20%S	100%R (sabbatical)	Maybe. <i>If overall rating and research rating the same, perhaps not needed.</i>
60%T, 30%R, 10%S	40%T, 50%R, 10%S	No
40%T, 50%R, 10%S	60%T, 20%R, 20%S	Maybe. <i>If teaching rating differs from the overall rating, it suggests a comprehensive review.</i>

**Question:** Wouldn't this suggest that there would have to be a comprehensive review after a sabbatical and another a year after returning from sabbatical?

**Answer:** Not necessarily. For someone whose sabbatical constitutes a normal part of his or her load over an extended period of time, this would not be required. The answer also may relate to the pattern of ratings. Consider these examples:

Professor X has been rated highly meritorious largely on the basis of performance in teaching (Load/ratings: 70%/HM for teaching; 15%/S for research; 15% HM for service). The load shifts to 100% research, which has been rated satisfactory. Does it make sense to carry forward the rating of HM?

Professor Y has been rated meritorious across the three categories, with a load of 40-40-20. The continuance of a rating of M seems appropriate, unless the chair and FSC perceive a need for a comprehensive review. The professor is also empowered to ask for a comprehensive review.